

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05226 302118Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15

ACDA-19 IO-14 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 DRC-01 /164 W

----- 118020

R 302015Z OCT 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2436

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3507

USMISSION BERLIN

S E C R E T USNATO 5226

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NEGOTIATED INSPECTION MEASURES

REF: STATE 194490 (NOTAL)

SUMMARY: INITIAL INSTRUCTED REACTIONS BY SOME ALLIES IN SPC TO U.S. PAPER ON VERIFICATION INDICATES INTEREST IN ALLIED ACCESS TO INFORMATION GAINED BY NATIONAL VERIFICATION MEANS AND IN MOBILE INSPECTION TEAMS. UK AND FRG AGREE WITH U.S. VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE CONSEQUENCES OF ANY GIVEN PROPOSAL AND SHOULD NOT PUT FORWARD SUCH PROPOSALS TOO SOON IN MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. SHAPE HAS REITERATED THE VIEW THAT OVERT ALLIANCE INSPECTION IS A PREREQUISITE FOR ALLIANCE SECURITY. SPC AND MBFR WORKING GROUP ARE NOW IN PROCESS OF SIFTING OUT POLITICAL AND MILITARY QUESTIONS IN U.S. PAPER, AND MISSION EXPECTS WORK IN NATO ON THIS SUBJECT TO PROCEED AT A STEADY PACE APPROPRIATE TO THE NEEDS OF THE NEGOTIATION. END SUMMARY.

1. INTERSPERSED WITH DISCUSSIONS LAST WEEK AND ON OCTOBER 29 ON DATA AND PRE-REDUCTION MEASURES, VARIOUS ALLIES PROVIDED  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05226 302118Z

INITIAL INSTRUCTED VIEWS IN SPC ON U.S. PAPER AND COVER NOTE (REFTEL) ON NEGOTIATED INSPECTION IN MBFR. THERE FOLLOWS A SUMMARY OF NATIONAL AND NATO MILITARY VIEWS WHICH HAVE BEGUN TO EMERGE IN THESE DISCUSSIONS, AND A PREVIEW OF NEXT STEPS IN NATO

2. MILITARY VIEWS. SHAPE REP MADE FORMAL STATEMENT IN SPC THAT OVERT ALLIANCE INSPECTION IS A PREREQUISITE FOR PRESERVING ALLIANCE SECURITY IN MBFR. HE ADDED THAT THIS POSITION WAS NOT INTENDED TO DIMINISH IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL MEANS OF VERIFICATION. MBFR WORKING GROUP, AT REQUEST OF SPC, HAS PRODUCED A COMPARATIVE TECHNICAL STUDY OF U.S. PAPER AND RELEVANT MBFR WORKING GROUP PAPERS INDICATING MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM, AS FOLLOWS:

QUOTE

"A. SERIAL 1 - NATIONAL MEANS OF VERIFICATION. THE U.S. PAPER EMPHASIZES MORE STRONGLY RELIANCE ON NATIONAL MEANS OF GATHERING INTELLIGENCE.

B. SERIAL 2 - MONITORING PHASES. THE U.S. PAPER DOES NOT SHOW A PRE-REDUCTION PHASE OF VERIFICATION.

C. SERIAL 9.E. - MANPOWER. WHERE COMPARABLE THE POSSIBLE MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR VARIOUS INSPECTION SYSTEM DIFFER.

D. SERIAL 10 - OPEN SKIES. THE U.S. PAPER, FOR THE FIRST TIME, GIVES TECHNICAL DETAILS OF THE 'OPEN SKIES' SYSTEM, IT

DOES NOT DISCUSS ACCEPTABILITY. THE ACCEPTABILITY STUDY (AC/276-D(72)1)

HOWEVER MAKES A TRUE 'OPEN SKIES' PROJECT VIRTUALLY UNACCEPTABLE TO NATO." END QUOTE.

WORKING GROUP PAPER CONCLUDES THAT "THE PAPERS INDICATE THAT THE MOST EFFECTIVE MONITORING SYSTEM WOULD INCLUDE MOBILE TEAMS SUPPORTED BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS, MLM'S AND MA'S, SOME STATIC POSTS AND AIR RECONNAISSANCE AND PHOTOGRAPHY."

FULL TEXT OF WORKING GROUP PAPER (DCMCM-15-73, 25 OCTOBER)

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05226 302118Z

POUCHED TO WASHINGTON NATO SUB-REGISTRIES.

3. FRG. FRG AGREES WITH IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL VERIFICATION MEANS, SINCE STRINGENT MEASURES WOULD PROBABLY BE NON-NEGOTIABLE, BUT ALSO CONSIDERS NECESSARY APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION BY ALLIES IN THE INFORMATION GAINED BY THOSE MEANS. BONN AGREES WITH U.S. VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT START TOO EARLY ON SPECIFIC PROPOSALS FOR INSPECTION. IT IS SUFFICIENT AT THE BEGINNING OF MBFR TALKS TO STRESS THE NEED FOR APPROPRIATE VERIFICATION AND TO ENSURE THAT ALLIES DO NOT PROVIDE SOVIETS WITH ANY RIGHT OF INTERFERENCE IN WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

4. ON MILITARY LIAISON MISSIONS, FRG WISHES TO AVOID ANY POSSIBILITY OF CREATING A SPECIAL STATUS FOR GERMANY AND THUS WOULD

NOT RPT NOT FAVOR SPECIFIC VERIFICATION MEANS WHICH WOULD EXPAND THE ROLE OF MLM'S. MLM'S HAVE ACQUIRED A SPECIAL STATUS AND HAVE A CERTAIN HISTORIAL GENESIS WHICH DICTATE AGAINST ANY ALTERATION OF THEIR ROLE. FRG FAVORS USE OF MOBILE INSPECTION TEAMS.

5. UK. LONDON CONSIDERS THAT ALLIES SHOULD SEEK BEST INSPECTION MEASURES WHICH CAN BE NEGOTIATED, WHICH HAVE INTRINSIC VALUE TO ALLIES. UK SHARES FRG VIEW OF IMPORTANCE OF MULTILATERAL ARRANGMENTS AND OF DESIRABILITY NOT TO COMMIT ALLIANCE TOO SOON TO SPECIFIC VERIFICATION MEASURES. ALLIES WILL NEED TO BEAR IN MIND LIKELY SOVIET DEMANDS FOR RECIPROCITY AND POSSIBLE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE EFFORTS. ON QUESTION OF MLM'S, UK FAVORS FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING THE FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT OF MLM'S. ON OTHER MEASURES, UK ALSO FAVORED MOBILE OBSERVATION TEAMS. BARRIER OR CHOKE POINTS SYSTEMS WOULD BE TOO EXPENSIVE IN MANPOWER AND EASILY CIRCUMVENTED. IT WOULD BE ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT TO HAVE ADEQUATE MOBILE TEAMS TO DO AN EFFECTIVE JOB, PARTICULARLY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND POLAND.

6. UK REP WONDERED IF U.S. PAPER WAS WRITTEN IN THE CONTEXT ONLY OF PHASE I OF MBFR, SINCE IT SPOKE ONLY OF WITHDRAWALS AND NOT OF DISBANDMENT. (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT. END COMMENT) HE ADDED THAT ALLIES SHOULD MAKE SOVIETS BEAR THE BURDEN OF SHOWING WHY THE THREE WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED. ALLIES WOULD NEED TO BE CAREFUL, HOWEVER, SINCE UK  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05226 302118Z

WAS OPPOSED TO ANY INCREASE IN AREA FOR NEGOTIATING INSPECTION ON WESTERN SIDE.

7. NETHERLANDS REP AGREED WITH FRG DESIRE FOR ALLIED PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL MEANS DATA, BUT DOUBTED THAT IT WOULD BE FEASIBLE. DUTCH FAVORED EMPHASIS ON JOINT PARTICIPATION IN INSPECTION MEASURES, PARTLY TO GIVE MBFR GREATER MULTILATERAL CHARACTER. DENMARK FAVORS OVERT MEANS, PARTICULARLY MOBILE INSPECTION TEAMS, IN WHICH DENMARK IS WILLING TO PARTICIPATE.

8. SPC WILL NOW BEGIN TO DRAW UP A LIST OF POINTS WHICH MIGHT BE COVERED IN AN EVENTUAL REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON VERIFICATION.

9. COMMENT: FOR FORTHCOMING DISCUSSIONS, WE WOULD APPRECIATE INDICATION OF WASHINGTON'S CURRENT THINKING ON QUESTION OF POSSIBLE ACCESS BY OTHER ALLIES TO INFORMATION OBTAINED BY NATIONAL INSPECTION MEANS. FRG DELEGATION EXPLAINED TO US PRIVATELY THAT THIS WILL BE PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT TO ALLIES, IF IT TURNS OUT THAT THEY WILL NEED TO RELY ALMOST ENTIRELY ON NATIONAL MEANS FOR VERIFYING AN MBFR AGREEMENT. END COMMENT  
MC AULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 30 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05226  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731064/abqcecyb.tel  
**Line Count:** 162  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 194490 (NOTAL)  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <26-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: NEGOTIATED INSPECTION MEASURES  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
BERLIN  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005